arXiv:1702.01190v1 [math-ph] 3 Feb 2017

SIX-VERTEX MODEL WITH HALF-TURN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

PAVEL BLEHER AND KARL LIECHTY

Abstract. We obtain asymptotic formulas for the partition function of the six-vertex model with half-turn boundary conditions in each of the phase regions. The proof is based on the Izergin–Korepin–Kuperberg determinantal formula for the partition function, its reduction to orthogonal polynomials, and on an asymptotic analysis of the orthogonal polynomials under consideration in the framework of the Riemann–Hilbert approach.

1. Introduction

This paper continues a program in which the partition function for the six-vertex model is rigorously analyzed in the thermodynamic limit. In previous works, the current authors and their collaborators have obtained exact asymptotic formulas of the partition function for the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions (DWBC) and partial domain wall boundary conditions (pDWBC) [BF06, BL09-1, BL09-2, BL10, BlBo12, BlBo14, BL14, BL15]. The six-vertex model with DWBC was originally introduced by Korepin [Kor82], who derived some recurrences for the model which were subsequently solved by Izergin [Ize87], giving an exact formula for the partition function of determinantal type. It is this determinantal formula, known as the Izergin–Korepin formula, which is the starting point in the asymptotic analysis for the DWBC partition function.

The states of the six-vertex model with DWBC correspond bijectively with *alternating sign matrices*, and the Izergin–Korepin formula was used by Kuperberg [Kup96] to prove the exact enumeration of alternating sign matrices which had been conjectured by Miils, Robbins, and Rumsey [MRR82] and proven by other means in [Zei96]. In a later work [Kup02] Kuperberg considered various symmetry classes of alternating sign matrices, and was able to give exact enumeraions for several such symmetry classes. Each of the symmetry classes studied in that paper correspond to different boundary conditions for the six-vertex model, and Kuperberg was able to give exact formulas for the partition functions of the corresponding six-vertex models. Each of these formulas is reminiscent of the Izergin–Korepin formula for the DWBC partition function, and involve either determinants or Pfaffians. In this paper we consider one of those boundary conditions, the *half-turn boundary conditions* (HTBC).

1.1. Definition of the model.

The six-vertex model with HTBC is realized on a rectangular lattice of size $n \times (2n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with additional edges connecting some of the

Date: February 7, 2017.

This work was performed during the program *Statistical mechanics and combinatorics* at the Simons Center for Geometry and Physics in March 2016. The authors are grateful for the hospitality of the Simons Center. KL would like to thank T. Kyle Petersen for helpful discussions involving Proposition 1.1. PB is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grants DMS-1265172 and DMS-1565602. KL is supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#357872).



FIGURE 1. An example of the arrow configuration with the partial domain wall boundary conditions on the 3×6 lattice.

vertices in the top row. Specifically, the vertex in the top row k steps from the left is connected to the one which is k steps from the right, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, see Figure 1. The states of the model are realized by placing arrows on the edges of the graph obeying the *ice rule*: at each vertex there are exactly two arrows pointing in and two arrows pointing out. The arrows on the left and right boundaries are fixed to point out of the lattice, and the arrows on the bottom boundary are fixed to point in. The arrows on the top boundary are free, up to the constraint imposed by the "half-turn" connection of the k-th and $(2n-k)$-th vertices from the left.

According to the ice rule, there are exactly six types of configuration at each vertex, and we label them with the numbers $1, 2, \dots, 6$ as in Figure 2. The Gibbs measure is defined by assigning a weight w_k, $k = 1, \dots, 6$ to each vertex-type. The weight of an arrow configuration σ is then defined as

$$w(\sigma) = \prod_{x \in V_{n,2n}} w_{t(x;\sigma)} = \prod_{j=1}^{6} w_i^{N_i(\sigma)}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $V_{n,2n}$ is the set of vertices in the lattice, $t(x;\sigma)$ is the type of vertex at the vertex $x \in V_{n,2n}$ in the configuration σ, and $N_i(\sigma)$ is the number of vertices of type i in the configuration σ. The Gibbs measure on states is then defined as

$$\mu(\sigma) = \frac{w(\sigma)}{Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}}, \qquad Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} \equiv Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, w_6) = \sum_{\sigma} w(\sigma), \tag{1.2}$$

where Z_n^{HT} is the *partition function*, and the sum is over all configurations obeying the HTBC.

1.2. **Reduction of parameters.** A priori there are six parameters in this model: the weights w_i. But in fact the boundary conditions impose some conservation laws which allow us to reduce the number of parameters to 3. Namely we have the following proposition, which is very similar to [BL15, Proposition 1.1].



FIGURE 2. The six types of vertices allowed under the ice-rule.

Proposition 1.1. *Any six-vertex configuration σ on a $n \times (2n)$ lattice satisfying HTBC satisfies the following equations.*

$$\begin{aligned} N_1(\sigma) + N_2(\sigma) + N_3(\sigma) + N_4(\sigma) + N_5(\sigma) + N_6(\sigma) &= 2n^2, \\ N_5(\sigma) - N_6(\sigma) &= n, \\ N_1(\sigma) - N_2(\sigma) + N_4(\sigma) - N_3(\sigma) &= n^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

The proof of this proposition is very similar to that of [BL15, Proposition 1.1], and we omit it here.

Let us now discuss how to use Proposition 1.1 to reduce the number of parameters. Let us write

$$w_1 = ae^{-\alpha}, \quad w_2 = ae^{\alpha}, \quad w_3 = be^{-\beta}, \quad w_4 = be^{\beta}, \quad w_5 = ce^{-\xi}, \quad w_6 = ce^{\xi}, \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &a = \sqrt{w_1 w_2}, \quad e^{\alpha} = \sqrt{\frac{w_2}{w_1}}, \quad b = \sqrt{w_3 w_4}, \quad e^{\beta} = \sqrt{\frac{w_4}{w_3}}, \\ &c = \sqrt{w_5 w_6}, \quad e^{\xi} = \sqrt{\frac{w_6}{w_5}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

Then

$$w_1^{N_1} w_2^{N_2} w_3^{N_3} w_4^{N_4} w_5^{N_5} w_6^{N_6} = a^{N_1+N_2} b^{N_3+N_4} c^{N_5+N_6} e^{\alpha(N_2-N_1)+\beta(N_4-N_3)+\xi(N_6-N_5)}. \tag{1.6}$$

Let

$$\alpha = \eta + \theta, \quad \beta = \eta - \theta; \qquad \eta = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}, \quad \theta = \frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}. \tag{1.7}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} w_1^{N_1} w_2^{N_2} w_3^{N_3} w_4^{N_4} w_5^{N_5} w_6^{N_6} &= a^{N_1+N_2} b^{N_3+N_4} c^{N_5+N_6} \\ &\times e^{\eta(N_2-N_1+N_4-N_3)+\theta(N_2-N_1-N_4+N_3)+\xi(N_6-N_5)}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

Using the second and third equations of (1.3), we obtain that

$$w_1^{N_1}w_2^{N_2}w_3^{N_3}w_4^{N_4}w_5^{N_5}w_6^{N_6} = (ae^{-\eta})^{N_1}(ae^{\eta})^{N_2}(be^{-\eta})^{N_3}(be^{\eta})^{N_4}c^{N_5}c^{N_6}e^{-n^2\theta-n\xi}. \tag{1.9}$$

From (1.5), (1.7),

$$e^{-\theta} = \left(\frac{w_1w_4}{w_2w_3}\right)^{1/4}, \quad e^{-\xi} = \left(\frac{w_5}{w_6}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{1.10}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} w_1^{N_1}w_2^{N_2}w_3^{N_3}w_4^{N_4}w_5^{N_5}w_6^{N_6} &= (ae^{-\eta})^{N_1}(ae^{\eta})^{N_2}(be^{-\eta})^{N_3}(be^{\eta})^{N_4}c^{N_5}c^{N_6} \\ &\times \left(\frac{w_1w_4}{w_2w_3}\right)^{n^2/4}\left(\frac{w_5}{w_6}\right)^{n/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

This implies the relation between partition functions,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(w_1,w_2,w_3,w_4,w_5,w_6) &= \left(\frac{w_1w_4}{w_2w_3}\right)^{n^2/4}\left(\frac{w_5}{w_6}\right)^{n/2} \\ &\times Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(ae^{-\eta},ae^{\eta},be^{-\eta},be^{\eta},c,c), \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

and between Gibbs measures,

$$\mu(\sigma;w_1,w_2,w_3,w_4,w_5,w_6) = \mu(\sigma;ae^{-\eta},ae^{\eta},be^{-\eta},be^{\eta},c,c). \tag{1.13}$$

Furthermore, using the first equation of (1.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(ae^{-\eta},ae^{\eta},be^{-\eta},be^{\eta},c,c) &= c^{2n^2}Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}}\left(\frac{ae^{-\eta}}{c},\frac{ae^{\eta}}{c},\frac{be^{-\eta}}{c},\frac{be^{\eta}}{c},1,1\right), \\ \mu(\sigma;ae^{-\eta},ae^{\eta},be^{-\eta},be^{\eta},c,c) &= \mu\left(\sigma;\frac{ae^{-\eta}}{c},\frac{ae^{\eta}}{c},\frac{be^{-\eta}}{c},\frac{be^{\eta}}{c},1,1\right), \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

and so the model reduces to the three parameters, $\frac{a}{c}$, $\frac{b}{c}$, and η.

1.3. **Main results.** In this paper we consider only the special case $\eta = 0$ for general a, b, and c. This is the case for which Kuperberg derived a determinantal formula for the partition function of the six-vertex model with HTBC, following the approach that Izergin–Korepin employed to derive a similar formula for the DWBC partition function. The main result of this paper is an asymptotic expansion of the partition function for the HTBC partition function when $\eta = 0$, and the starting point for this analysis is the determinantal formula of Kuperberg, henceforth referred to as the Izergin–Korepin–Kuperberg formula. In order to state the results, it is convenient to parametrize the weights a, b, and c in slightly different ways in the different regions of the phase diagram.

For $\eta = 0$ the phase diagram of the HTBC six-vertex model consists of three phase regions which are described nicely in terms of the parameter

$$\Delta = \frac{a^2+b^2-c^2}{2ab}.$$

If $\Delta > 1$ then we are in the *ferroelectric phase*; if $\Delta < -1$ then we are in the *anti-ferroelectric phase*; and if $-1 < \Delta < 1$, then we are in the *disordered phase*. For each of the phase regions, it is convenient to parametrize the weights in slightly different ways. For the ferroelectric phase,

$$a = \sinh(t-\gamma), \quad b = \sinh(t+\gamma), \quad c = \sinh(2|\gamma|), \quad 0 < |\gamma| < t; \tag{1.15}$$

for the anti-ferroelectric phase,

$$a = \sinh(\gamma - t), \quad b = \sinh(\gamma + t), \quad c = \sinh(2\gamma), \quad |t| < \gamma; \tag{1.16}$$

and for the disordered phase

$$a = \sin(\gamma - t), \quad b = \sin(\gamma + t), \quad c = \sin(2\gamma), \quad |t| < \gamma. \tag{1.17}$$

The Izergin–Korepin–Kuperberg formula for the partition function Z_n^{HT} is then described in the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2. *Consider the six-vertex model with HTBC with weights $w_1 = w_2 = a$, $w_3 = w_4 = b$, $w_5 = w_6 = c$, where the weights are parametrized by* (1.15), (1.16), *or* (1.17), *depending on the phase region. Then the partition function Z_n^{HT} is given as*

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = \frac{(ab)^{2n^2}}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}(j!)^4}\, \tau_n^{\mathrm{DW}}\, \tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}}\,, \tag{1.18}$$

where

$$\tau_n^{\mathrm{DW}} = \det\left(\phi^{(j+k-2)}(t)\right)_{j,k=1}^{n}, \quad \phi(t) = \frac{c}{ab}\,, \tag{1.19}$$

and

$$\tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = \det\left(\psi^{(j+k-2)}(t)\right)_{j,k=1}^{n}, \quad \psi(t) = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b}\,, \tag{1.20}$$

and the dependence of the functions $\phi(t)$ and $\psi(t)$ on t comes from the dependence of the parameters a and b on t in parameterizations (1.15)-(1.17).

This proposition follows from the result of Kuperberg for the inhomogeneous six-vertex model with HTBC presented in [Kup02, Theorem 10]. In order to obtain (1.18), one needs to take a homogeneous limit of Kuperberg's formula.

Observe that we can write (1.18) as

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = Z_n^{\mathrm{DW}}\, \widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathrm{HT}}, \tag{1.21}$$

where

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{DW}} = \frac{(ab)^{n^2}}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} j!^2}\tau_n^{\mathrm{DW}}, \qquad \widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = \frac{(ab)^{n^2}}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} j!^2}\tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}}. \tag{1.22}$$

The factor Z_n^{DW} is exactly the partition function for the six-vertex model on an $n \times n$ lattice with domain wall boundary conditions, and has been evaluated asymptotically as $n \to \infty$ in each of the phase regions a series of papers [BF06, BL09-1, BL10]. Thus to evaluate (1.18) in the thermodynamic limit, we need only evaluate $\widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathrm{HT}}$, or equivalently the determinant τ_n^{HT}, asymptotically as $n \to \infty$. That analysis comprises the main technical work of this paper, and it leads to the following results for the asymptotics of the HTBC partition function.

Theorem 1.3 (Disordered phase)**.** *Let Z_n^{HT} be the partition function for the six-vertex model with half-turn boundary conditions, with the parametrization of weights as in the disordered phase* (1.17). *As $n \to \infty$,*

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = C n^{\kappa} F^{2n^2}(1 + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})), \tag{1.23}$$

where

$$F = \frac{\pi ab}{2\gamma \cos\frac{\pi t}{2\gamma}}, \quad \kappa = \frac{1}{6} - \frac{\gamma^2}{3\pi(\pi - 2\gamma)}, \tag{1.24}$$

and the constant C is of the form

$$C = \left[\cos\left(\frac{\pi t}{2\gamma}\right)\right]^{\kappa} D(\gamma), \tag{1.25}$$

where $D(\gamma)$ does not depend on t.

Theorem 1.4 (Antiferroelectric phase)**.** *Let Z_n^{HT} be the partition function for the six-vertex model with half-turn boundary conditions, with the parametrization of weights as in the antiferroelectric phase* (1.16)*. As $n \to \infty$,*

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = C\vartheta_3(n\omega)\vartheta_4(n\omega)F^{2n^2}(1 + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})), \tag{1.26}$$

where

$$F = \frac{\pi ab\vartheta_1'(0)}{\gamma\vartheta_1(\omega)}, \quad \omega = \frac{\pi}{2}(1+\zeta), \quad \zeta = \frac{t}{\gamma}, \tag{1.27}$$

ϑ_1, ϑ_3, and ϑ_4 are the Jacobi theta functions (see (4.5) *for their definitions) with elliptic nome $q = e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{2\gamma}}$, and the constant C is independent of both n and t.*

Theorem 1.5 (Ferroelectric phase)**.** *Let Z_n^{HT} be the partition function for the six-vertex model with half-turn boundary conditions, with the parametrization of weights as in the ferroelectric phase* (1.15)*. We assume here that $\gamma > 0$, so that $b > a + c$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ as $n \to \infty$,*

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = CG^{2n}F^{2n^2}(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-n^{1-\varepsilon}})), \tag{1.28}$$

where

$$F = b, \quad G = e^{\gamma - t}, \quad C = (1 + e^{-4\gamma})(1 - e^{-4\gamma}). \tag{1.29}$$

The proofs of the above theorems follow very closely the proofs of the asymptotic expansion of Z_n^{DW}, in which the Hankel determinant τ_n^{DW} is expressed in terms of a system of orthogonal polynomials which is then evaluated asymptotically as the degree of the polynomial becomes large. Any information about the constant term in the asymptotic expansion is gleaned from the fact that τ_n^{DW} satisfies the *Toda equation*,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\log\tau_n = \frac{\tau_{n+1}\tau_{n-1}}{\tau_n^2}. \tag{1.30}$$

In each of the phase regions, the asymptotic analysis of τ_n^{HT} is very similar. It also satisfies the Toda equation, so (1.30) holds for either $\tau_n = \tau_n^{\mathrm{DW}}$ or $\tau_n = \tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}}$. Also τ_n^{HT} may be expressed in terms of a system of orthogonal polynomials, and it turn out these orthogonal polynomials are very similar to the ones for τ_n^{DW}. Indeed, asymptotically they differ only in subleading terms.

1.4. **Plan for the rest of the paper.** In Section 2, the symbol $\psi(t)$ appearing in the Hankel determinant τ_n^{HT} is expressed as a Laplace-type transform of some measure on the real line in each of the phase regions. This is the first step to expressing τ_n^{HT} in terms of orthogonal polynomials. Then Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 are proven in Sections 3, 4, and 5, respectively. In each case, two systems of orthogonal polynomials are discussed: those relevant for τ_n^{DW} and those for τ_n^{HT}. The asymptotic results for the former system are recalled, and the new asymptotic results for the latter system are stated. Since the analysis is very similar for both systems of orthogonal polynomials, we simply describe the adjustments that must be made

to the analyses of the polynomials corresponding to τ_n^{DW}, as presented in [BL14], in order to apply to the polynomials corresponding to τ_n^{HT}. In each of the sections 3-5 we use the same notation for the relevant systems of orthogonal polynomials even though they are different in each section. We trust it will not confuse the reader.

1.5. **Outlook.** As noted earlier in the introduction, Kuperberg [Kup02] has given exact formulas for the partition functions of the six-vertex model with several different boundary conditions. In [Kup02, Theorem 10], we find a list of eight such formulas. This list includes the well-known DWBC partition function as well as the partition function for the U-boundary condition which had been previously found by Tsuchiya [Tsu98]. Tsuchiya's determinantal formula is generalized to the UU-boundary condition, and new formulas are also given for half-turn (HT), quarter-turn (QT), off-diagonal (O), off-diagonal-off-anti-diagonal (OO), and U-off-antidiagonal (UO) boundary conditions. After DWBC and HTBC, it is natural to ask whether the remaining partition functions in this list may be analyzed asymptotically.

For the U- and UU-boundary conditions, the formulas for Z_n are determinantal and involve the Tsuchiya determinant. After taking the homogeneous limit this determinant is not a Hankel determinant, but may be expressed in terms of certain *bi*-orthogonal polynomials. Rather than satisfying the Toda equation (1.30), the Tsuchiya determinant satisfies a two dimensional version of (1.30). This fact was used in [RK15] to derive the free energy for the U-boundary condition partition function in the disordered phase. A rigorous asymptotic analysis following [BL14] would require rather general machinery for asymptotic analysis of bi-orthogonal polynomials. At the moment that machinery is missing.

For the remaining four partition functions formulated by Kuperberg (QT, O, OO, UO), the formulas involve Pfaffians rather than determinants. For Pfaffians, orthogonal polynomial methods do not apply, although it may be possible to write his formulas in terms of systems of skew-orthogonal polynomials. Again there is not currently any general machinery for asymptotic analysis of skew-orthogonal polynomials, so the methods of this paper and [BL14] do not apply.

2. The Laplace transform

The first step in the asymptotic analysis of τ_n^{HT} is to write the symbol $\psi(t) = 1/a + 1/b$ as the Laplace transform of some measure on the real line. This representation is different for the different phase regions, and is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *In the ferroelectric phase, in which a and b parametrized as* (1.15)*, we have that*

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sinh(t-\gamma)} + \frac{1}{\sinh(t+\gamma)} = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}[e^{-2k(t-\gamma)} + e^{-2k(t+\gamma)}]. \tag{2.1}$$

In the antiferroelectric phase, in which a and b parametrized as (1.16)*, we have that*

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sinh(\gamma-t)} + \frac{1}{\sinh(\gamma+t)} = 2\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{(2k+1)t-|2k+1|\gamma}. \tag{2.2}$$

In the disordered phase, in which a and b parametrized as (1.17)*, we have that*

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sin(\gamma-t)} + \frac{1}{\sin(\gamma+t)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{t\lambda} m(\lambda)\, d\lambda\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$m(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-\gamma\lambda}}{1+e^{-\pi\lambda}} + \frac{e^{\gamma\lambda}}{1+e^{\pi\lambda}}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Equations (2.1) and (2.2) follow in a straightforward way using geometric series. For (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sinh(t-\gamma)} + \frac{1}{\sinh(t+\gamma)} &= \frac{2e^{-(t-\gamma)}}{1-e^{-2(t-\gamma)}} + \frac{2e^{-(t+\gamma)}}{1-e^{-2(t+\gamma)}} \\
&= 2e^{-(t-\gamma)}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-2k(t-\gamma)} + 2e^{-(t+\gamma)}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-2k(t+\gamma)} \\
&= 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}[e^{-(2k+1)(t-\gamma)} + e^{-(2k+1)(t+\gamma)}] \\
&= 2e^{-(t-\gamma)}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}[e^{-2k(t-\gamma)} + e^{-2k(t+\gamma)-2\gamma}] \\
&= 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}[e^{-2k(t-\gamma)} + e^{-2k(t+\gamma)}],
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where we have used the restriction $|\gamma| < t$ to ensure convergence of the series. The proof of (2.2) is very similar, where we use $|t| < \gamma$ to ensure convergence, and we omit it here. We are left only to prove (2.3) and (2.4).

Let $t = i\tau$. Then (2.3) reads

$$\psi(i\tau) = \frac{1}{\sin(\gamma - i\tau)} + \frac{1}{\sin(\gamma + i\tau)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\tau\lambda} m(\lambda)\, d\lambda = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\tau\lambda}[m_-(\lambda) + m_+(\lambda)]\, d\lambda\,, \tag{2.6}$$

hence, taking the inverse Fourier transform,

$$m_+(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sin(\gamma + i\tau)}\, e^{-i\tau\lambda} d\tau\,. \tag{2.7}$$

Shifting the contour of integration up by $i\pi$ and evaluating the residue at $\tau = i\gamma$, we obtain the equation,

$$m_+(\lambda) = -m_+(\lambda)e^{\pi\lambda} + e^{\gamma\lambda}, \tag{2.8}$$

hence

$$m_+(\lambda) = \frac{e^{\gamma\lambda}}{1+e^{\pi\lambda}}\,. \tag{2.9}$$

Similarly, for

$$m_-(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-i\tau\lambda}}{\sin(\gamma - i\tau)}\, d\tau\,. \tag{2.10}$$

we obtain the equation,

$$m_-(\lambda) = -m_+(\lambda)e^{-\pi\lambda} + e^{-\gamma\lambda}, \tag{2.11}$$

hence

$$m_-(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-\gamma\lambda}}{1+e^{-\pi\lambda}}\,, \tag{2.12}$$

and (2.3) follows. □

3. Disordered Phase

Let us consider two different systems of orthogonal polynomials on $\mathbb{R}$. They are defined in terms of the two orthogonality weights

$$w^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) = \frac{e^{tx}\sinh\left[\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\gamma\right)x\right]}{\sinh\frac{\pi x}{2}}, \qquad w^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) = \frac{e^{tx}\cosh\left[\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\gamma\right)x\right]}{\cosh\frac{\pi x}{2}}. \tag{3.1}$$

We then define two systems of monic orthogonal polynomials $\{P_k^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{P_k^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)P_k^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)w^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) = h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}\delta_{jk}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)P_k^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)w^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) = h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}\delta_{jk}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ are two sequences of normalizing constants, and P_k^{DW} and P_k^{HT} are monic polynomials of degree exactly k. Notice that the weight $w^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)$ is the same as $e^{tx}m(x)$ where $m(x)$ is defined in (2.4). The polynomials orthogonal with respect to $w^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)$ are the ones which appear in the study of the partition function of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions, and the two determinants τ_n^{DW} and τ_n^{HT} can be written explicitly in terms of the normalizing constants h_k^{DW} and h_k^{HT}, respectively. Indeed we have

$$\tau_n^{\mathrm{DW}} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}, \qquad \tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Thus the partition function (1.18) may be written as

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = (ab)^{2n^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2}. \tag{3.5}$$

In the work [BL14], see also [BL14, Chapter 6], a very precise asymptotic formula is obtained for the sequence of constants h_k^{DW} as $k\to\infty$ using the Riemann–Hilbert method. The following result is given in [BL14, Proposition 6.1.2].

Proposition 3.1. *As $k\to\infty$, the normalizing constants h_k^{DW} satisfy*

$$\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2} = G^{2k+1}\left(1+\frac{\kappa^{\mathrm{DW}}}{k}+\varepsilon_k+\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})\right), \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$G = \frac{\pi}{2\gamma\cos\left(\frac{\pi\zeta}{2}\right)}, \quad \zeta = \frac{t}{\gamma}, \quad \kappa^{\mathrm{DW}} = \frac{1}{12}-\frac{2\gamma^2}{3\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}, \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_k = \left[\cos(k\omega)+\tan\left(\frac{\pi\zeta}{2}\right)\sin(k\omega)\right]\sum_{j:\ \kappa_j<2} c_j k^{-\kappa_j}. \tag{3.8}$$

Here

$$\omega = -\pi(1+\zeta), \qquad \kappa_j = 1+\frac{2j}{\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1} > 1, \qquad j=1,2,\dots, \tag{3.9}$$

and the numbers c_j are equal to

$$c_j = d_j \sin\left(\frac{\pi j}{1-\frac{2\gamma}{\pi}}\right), \qquad j = 1, 2, \dots, \tag{3.10}$$

where $d_j \neq 0$.

In light of equation (3.5), this proposition is a key ingredient in the proof of Theorem (1.3). We also need an asymptotic formula for the sequence h_k^{HT}. Before presenting that result, we briefly comment on the two systems of orthogonal polynomials (3.2) and (3.3). The weights (3.1) are identical except that cosh and sinh are interchanged. It may not be surprising to the reader then that the asymptotic analysis is very similar for both systems of orthogonal polynomials. Consider the rescaled weights

$$\begin{aligned} w_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) &= w^{\mathrm{DW}}\left(\frac{nx}{\gamma}\right) = \frac{e^{n\zeta x}\sinh\left[n\left(\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1\right)x\right]}{\sinh\frac{n\pi x}{2\gamma}}, \\ w_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) &= w^{\mathrm{HT}}\left(\frac{nx}{\gamma}\right) = \frac{e^{n\zeta x}\cosh\left[n\left(\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1\right)x\right]}{\cosh\frac{n\pi x}{2\gamma}}, \quad \zeta = \frac{t}{\gamma}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

they may be written as

$$w_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) = e^{-nV_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)}, \qquad w_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) = e^{-nV_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)}, \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$V_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) = -\zeta x - \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{\sinh\left[n\left(\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1\right)x\right]}{\sinh\frac{n\pi x}{2\gamma}}, \quad V_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) = -\zeta x - \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{\cosh\left[n\left(\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1\right)x\right]}{\cosh\frac{n\pi x}{2\gamma}}. \tag{3.13}$$

This rescaling of the weight is the first step in the Riemann–Hilbert analysis of the orthogonal polynomials (3.2) done in [BF06, BL14]. Notice that as $n \to \infty$, both $V_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)$ and $V_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)$ approach the same limit:

$$V_n^{\mathrm{DW}}(x) \to V(x), \qquad V_n^{\mathrm{HT}}(x) \to V(x) \equiv -\zeta x + |x|. \tag{3.14}$$

This indicates that the orthogonal polynomials (3.3) will differ from the ones (3.2) only in subleading terms as $k \to \infty$. Indeed, it requires only minor adjustments of the Riemann–Hilbert analysis presented in [BL14, Chapter 6] to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *As $k \to \infty$, the normalizing constants h_k^{HT} satisfy*

$$\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2} = G^{2k+1}\left(1 + \frac{\kappa^{\mathrm{HT}}}{k} + \varepsilon_k + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})\right), \tag{3.15}$$

where G is as in (3.7)*,*

$$\kappa^{\mathrm{HT}} = \frac{1}{12} + \frac{\gamma^2}{3\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}, \tag{3.16}$$

and ε_k is as in (3.8)-(3.10) *except that the numbers c_j are given as*

$$c_j = d_j \cos\left(\frac{\pi(j-1/2)}{1-\frac{2\gamma}{\pi}}\right), \qquad j = 1, 2, \dots, \tag{3.17}$$

where $d_j \neq 0$.

Combining Theorem 3.2, Proposition 3.1, and equation (3.5) we immediately obtain that for some $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$Z_n = Cn^{\kappa} F^{2n^2}(1 + \mathcal{O}(n^{-\varepsilon})), \tag{3.18}$$

where

$$F = \frac{\pi ab}{2\gamma \cos \frac{\pi t}{2\gamma}}, \quad \kappa = \kappa^{\mathrm{HT}} + \kappa^{\mathrm{DW}} = \frac{1}{6} - \frac{\gamma^2}{3\pi(\pi - 2\gamma)}, \tag{3.19}$$

and C is an unknown constant. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, we must improve the error to $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ and prove that the constant C is of the form (1.25). The fact that the error is in fact $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ follows from the oscillatory nature of the constants ε_k which appear in (3.6) and (3.15). For a proof that $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k = \text{const.} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, see [BL14, proof of Theorem 6.1.3]. The proof that the constant term C is of the form (1.25) relies on the fact that the determinants τ_n^{DW} and τ_n^{HT} both satisfy the Toda equation 1.30. Then the dependence of the constant C on the parameter t can be obtained exactly as in [BL14, Section 6.8]. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The complete Riemann–Hilbert analysis necessary to prove Theorem (3.2) is quite involved and we do not repeat it here since it is nearly identical to the analysis of [BF06], [BL14, Chapter 6]. Instead we simply list the relatively few changes which must be made to the analysis of [BL14, Chapter 6] to deal with the weight $w^{\mathrm{HT}}(x)$ rather than $w^{\mathrm{DW}}(x)$. The key ingredient in the Riemann–Hilbert analysis is the computation of the equilibrium measure, which is calculated in [BL14, Section 6.3]. As noted earlier, the two potentials V_n^{DW} and V_n^{HT} have the same limit as $n \to \infty$, and so the calculation of the limiting equilibrium measure for V_n^{HT} is exactly as shown in [BL14, Section 6.3.1]. The only difference is in the subleading corrections to the equilibrium measure, which are calculated in [BL14, Section 6.3.2]. In this calculation the primary difference is that coth must be replaced with tanh in equations (6.3.24) and (6.3.26) of [BL14]. Then the calculation in equation (6.3.54) becomes[1]

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f(x) dx &= \int_0^{\infty} x \left[\frac{\pi}{\gamma} \tanh \frac{\pi x}{2\gamma} - \frac{\pi - 2\gamma}{\gamma} \tanh \frac{(\pi - 2\gamma)x}{\gamma} - 2 \operatorname{sgn} x \right] dx \\
&= 2 \int_0^{\infty} x \left[\left(\frac{\pi}{\gamma} - 2 \right) \frac{1}{e^{x(\pi/\gamma - 2)} + 1} - \frac{\pi}{\gamma} \frac{1}{e^{x\pi/\gamma} + 1} \right] dx \\
&= -2 \left(\frac{\gamma}{\pi} - \frac{\gamma}{\pi - 2\gamma} \right) \int_0^{\infty} \frac{u}{e^u + 1} \, du \\
&= -2 \left(\frac{\gamma}{\pi} - \frac{\gamma}{\pi - 2\gamma} \right) \frac{\pi^2}{12} = \frac{\pi \gamma^2}{3(\pi - 2\gamma)} \, .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Notice that the final result of this calculation differs from the original one in [BL14, Equation (6.3.54)] by a factor of $-(1/2)$. As a result, the RHS of equations (6.3.55) and (6.3.56) is changed by a factor of $-(1/2)$, as do the n^{-2}-terms in equations (6.3.57), (6.3.58), and

[1] There is a typo in [BL14, Equation (6.3.54)]. All integrals after the first line should be from 0 to ∞, not $-\infty$ to ∞.

(6.3.60). Thus in Proposition 6.3.2, the terms of the order n^{-2} are changed by a factor of $-(1/2)$.

The calculations in [BL14, Sections 6.3.4, 6.3.5)], in which the density and resolvent of the equilibrium measure are calculated, may be repeated verbatim keeping in mind that the endpoints α_n and β_n have been adjusted in the subleading terms. The next section [BL14, Section 6.3.6] requires some modification. The terms of order n^{-2} in the expansion of α_n and β_n are expressed as Δ in equation (6.3.90), and so the definition of Δ given in (6.3.91) must be changed by a factor of $(-1/2)$, as must the RHS of both equations in (6.3.119). Then the first terms in the RHS of (6.3.128) and (6.3.133) are also multiplied by $(-1/2)$, the calculations in the remainder of the section are adjusted accordingly, and we find that (6.3.138) becomes

$$e^{nl_n} = \frac{(\beta-\alpha)^{2n}}{2^{4n}e^{2n}}\left(1+\frac{\gamma^2}{3n\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}+\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})\right). \tag{3.21}$$

As a result of the above formula, in equations (6.7.4)-(6.7.6), the term $-\frac{2\gamma^2}{3n\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}$ is replaced with $\frac{\gamma^2}{3n\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}$, and so the n^{-1} term in the expansion of h_n becomes

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{12}+\frac{\gamma^2}{3n\pi(\pi-2\gamma)}, \tag{3.22}$$

which is exactly the κ^{HT} given in (3.16).

The changes in the Riemann–Hilbert analysis of [BL14, Sections 6.4-6] are quite minor. In equations (6.5.8), (6.5.13), and (6.5.20), sinh must be replaced by cosh. Then in equation (6.6.15) the poles are at the points

$$z_j = \frac{i(j-1/2)\pi}{n(\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1)}. \tag{3.23}$$

In (6.6.16)[2] and (6.6.18), sin should be replaced with cos, and y_j should be defined as

$$y_j = \frac{(j-1/2)\pi}{\frac{\pi}{2\gamma}-1}, \tag{3.24}$$

and in (6.1.26), the numbers c_j are subsequently defined as

$$c_j = d_j\cos\left(\frac{\pi(j-1/2)}{1-2\gamma/\pi}\right), \quad j=1,2,\dots. \tag{3.25}$$

□

4. Anti-ferroelectric phase

In the anti-ferroelectric phase $c > a+b$, the weights a, b, and c are parametrized as in (1.16). We consider the two sequences of monic orthogonal polynomials

$$\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)P_k^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)e^{2t\ell-2\gamma|\ell|} = h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}\delta_{jk}, \quad \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)P_k^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)e^{(2\ell+1)t-|2\ell+1|\gamma} = h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}\delta_{jk}, \tag{4.1}$$

[2]There is a typo in [BL14, Equation (6.6.16)]. z_j should be replaced with y_j, and the definition of y_j should be made earlier.

where $\{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ are sequences of normalizing constants. The orthogonal polynomials $P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)$ appear in the analysis of the six-vertex model with DWBC [BL10], [BL14, Chapter 7], and that partition function is given as

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{DW}} = (2ab)^{n^2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2}. \tag{4.2}$$

Using the formula (2.2) for the function $\psi(t)$, we find that the Hankel determinant τ_n^{HT} defined in (1.20) can be expressed in terms of the orthogonal polynomials $P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)$. Indeed we have

$$\tau_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = 2^{n^2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Thus (1.21) and (1.22) can be written as

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = (2ab)^{2n^2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2}. \tag{4.4}$$

The asymptotic formulas for the constants h_k^{DW} and h_k^{HT} involve Jacobi theta functions, so we recall their definitions here. The four Jacobi theta functions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\vartheta_1(z) \equiv \vartheta_1(z;q) &= 2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \sin\left((2n+1)z\right), \\
\vartheta_2(z) \equiv \vartheta_2(z;q) &= 2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \cos\left((2n+1)z\right), \\
\vartheta_3(z) \equiv \vartheta_3(z;q) &= 1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^2} \cos(2nz), \\
\vartheta_4(z) \equiv \vartheta_4(z;q) &= 1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{n^2} \cos(2nz),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where q is a complex number called the *elliptic nome* satisfying $|q| < 1$. Note that the third and fourth theta functions are related by a shift:

$$\vartheta_3(z;q) = \vartheta_4\left(z + \frac{\pi}{2}; q\right). \tag{4.6}$$

In what follows we will fix the elliptic nome for all theta functions to be

$$q = e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{2\gamma}}, \tag{4.7}$$

and suppress the dependence on q from the notation.

In [BL10, Proposition 13.1], see also [BL14, Proposition 7.3.1], the following asymptotic formula is obtained for the constants h_k^{DW}.

Proposition 4.1. *As $k \to \infty$, the normalizing constants h_k^{DW} satisfy*

$$\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2} = G^{2k+1} \frac{\vartheta_4((k+1)\omega)}{\vartheta_4(k\omega)} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(k^{-2})\right), \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\omega = \frac{\pi}{2}(1+\zeta), \quad G = \frac{\pi\vartheta_1'(0)}{2\gamma\vartheta_1(\omega)}, \quad \zeta = \frac{t}{\gamma}. \tag{4.9}$$

This proposition was proved in [BL14] using the method of nonlinear steepest descent for the discrete Riemann–Hilbert problem associated with the orthogonal polynomials. Since the weight of the orthogonal polynomials $P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)$ differs from that of $P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)$ only by a shift, we can expect a very similar analysis for the orthogonal polynomials $P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)$. Indeed, making minor modifications to the analysis of [BL10], [BL14, Chapter 7], we can prove the following theorem

Theorem 4.2. *As $k \to \infty$, the normalizing constants h_k^{HT} satisfy*

$$\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2} = G^{2k+1}\frac{\vartheta_3((k+1)\omega)}{\vartheta_3(k\omega)}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(k^{-2})\right), \tag{4.10}$$

where G, ω, and ζ are defined in (4.9).

Combining Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 with equation (4.4) proves Theorem 1.4, up to the statement that the constant C does not depend of γ. This fact follows from the fact that both the determinants τ_n^{DW} and τ_n^{HT} satisfy the Toda equation (1.30), and is proven exactly as in [BL14, Section 7.7].

To prove Theorem 4.2 we describe the minor changes which must be made in the Riemann–Hilbert analysis of [BL14, Chapter 7] to deal with the orthogonal polynomials $P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)$ instead of $P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)$. The key difference is that the weight of orthogonality is shifted. After rescaling the polynomials as in [BL14, Equation (7.1.9)], the lattice supporting the measure of orthogonality given in [BL14, Equation (7.1.10)] is

$$L_n = \left\{x_k = \frac{\gamma}{n}(2k-1) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}. \tag{4.11}$$

Then the function $\Pi(z)$ defined in [BL14, Equation (7.5.7)] used to interpolate the poles in the Riemann–Hilbert problem should be changed to

$$\Pi(z) = \frac{2\gamma}{n\pi}\cos\left(\frac{n\pi z}{2\gamma}\right), \tag{4.12}$$

and the interpolating matrices $D_\pm^u$ and $D_\pm^l$ defined in [BL14, Equations (7.5.7) and (7.5.10)] should be

$$D_\pm^u(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{\Delta_n w_n(z)}{\Pi(z)}e^{\pm i\pi(\frac{nz}{2\gamma}+\frac{1}{2})} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_\pm^l(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi(z)^{-1} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\Delta_n w_n(z)}e^{\pm i\pi(\frac{nz}{2\gamma}+\frac{1}{2})} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.13}$$

Also in the second transformation of the RHP which defines $\mathbf{S}_n(z)$ in terms of $\mathbf{T}_n(z)$, exponential factors of the form $e^{\pm in\pi z/(2\gamma)}$ should be replaced with $e^{\pm i\pi(\frac{nz}{2\gamma}+\frac{1}{2})}$. The result is that in the jump matrices for $\mathbf{S}_n(z)$ given in [BL14, equation (7.5.24)], all exponential factors of the form $e^{\pm in\pi z/\gamma}$ are replaced with $-e^{\pm in\pi z/\gamma}$. This plays little role for the jump matrices which converge to the identity matrix as $n \to \infty$, but the diagonal terms of the jump matrix on the interval $[\alpha', \beta']$ are changed by sign. Then the phase Ω_n defined in [BL14, Equation (7.5.26)] should be

$$\Omega_n = n\pi(1+\zeta). \tag{4.14}$$

Analysis throughout the rest of the chapter is nearly identical, with Ω_n shifted by π. The solution to the model RHP presented in [BL14, equation (7.5.56)] involves ϑ_3 with an argument involving $\Omega_n/2$. When $\Omega_n/2$ is shifted by $\pi/2$, it is equivalent to replacing ϑ_3 with ϑ_4. It follows then that the result of [BL14, Proposition 7.5.1] holds with ϑ_3 replacing ϑ_4, and thus [BL14, equation (7.6.76)] also holds with ϑ_3 replacing ϑ_4. The rest of the analysis in [BL14, Chapter 7] is identical, and we arrive at Theorem 4.2, which is identical to Proposition 4.1 but with ϑ_3 replacing ϑ_4.

5. Ferroelectric phase

Now consider the ferroelectric phase $b > a + c$, where the weights a, b, and c are parametrized by (1.15). In this case the two relevant systems of monic orthogonal polynomials are defined via the orthogonality conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)P_k^{\mathrm{DW}}(\ell)[e^{-2\ell(t-\gamma)} - e^{-2\ell(t+\gamma)}] &= h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}\delta_{jk},\\ \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)P_k^{\mathrm{HT}}(\ell)[e^{-2\ell(t-\gamma)} + e^{-2\ell(t+\gamma)-2\gamma}] &= h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}\delta_{jk}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

As shown in [BL09-1], [BL14, Chapter 8], the DWBC partition function is given as

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{DW}} = (2ab)^{n^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2}. \tag{5.2}$$

Using (1.20), (2.1), and (1.22), we also find that $\widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathrm{HT}}$ is given as

$$\widetilde{Z}_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = (2ab)^{n^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2}, \tag{5.3}$$

thus (1.21) becomes

$$Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} = (2ab)^{2n^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{(k!)^2}\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{(k!)^2}, \tag{5.4}$$

In the previous work [BL09-1], see also [BL14, Chapter 8], the constants h_k^{DW} were compared asymptotically with the analogous constants associated with the classical Meixner polynomials, defined for example in [KLS]. The classical Meixner polynomials depend on two parameters denoted q and β in [KLS], and we are interested in the specialization $\beta = 0$. The shifted and monic version of these polynomials satisfy the orthogonality condition

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} P_j^{\mathrm{Q}}(\ell)P_k^{\mathrm{Q}}(\ell)q^j = h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}\delta_{jk}, \qquad h_k^{\mathrm{Q}} = \frac{(k!)^2q^{k+1}}{(1-q)^{2k+1}}, \tag{5.5}$$

see [BL14, Section 8.2] for a discussion. Both of the weights in (5.1) are very close to the Meixner weight with $q = e^{-2(t-\gamma)}$, in that they are both of the form $q^\ell \pm \tilde{q}^\ell$ where $\tilde{q} < q$. It is shown in [BL09-1] that the smaller term $\tilde{q}^\ell$ has vey little effect on the constants h_k^{DW} as $k \to \infty$. The following proposition repeats the result of [BL09-1, Theorem 1.1] for h_k^{DW} and extends it to h_k^{HT}. The proof of the result for h_k^{HT} is identical to the proof for h_k^{DW} and we refer the reader to [BL14, Section 8.4].

Proposition 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $k \to \infty$ the normalizing constants h_k^{DW} and h_k^{HT} defined in (5.1) satisfy*

$$h_k^{\mathrm{DW}} = h_k^{\mathrm{HT}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-k^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)\right) = h_k^{\mathrm{Q}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-k^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)\right), \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$q = e^{-2(t-\gamma)}. \tag{5.7}$$

Applying this proposition to the formula (5.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^{\mathrm{HT}} &= (2ab)^{2n^2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{q^{2k+2}}{(1-q)^{4k+2}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-n^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)\right) \\ &= (2ab)^{2n^2} \frac{q^{n^2+n}}{(1-q)^{2n^2}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-n^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)\right) \\ &= C \sinh(t+\gamma)^{n^2} e^{-2n(t-\gamma)} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-n^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$C = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}}. \tag{5.9}$$

The value of $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}}$ was found in [BL09-1] to be

$$\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{DW}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}} = 1 - e^{-4\gamma}. \tag{5.10}$$

In the proof of this fact, see [BL14, section 8.5], we consider the regime $\gamma > 0$ is fixed and $t \to +\infty$. In this regime it is shown that the primary contribution to the product comes from the first factor,

$$\frac{h_0^{\mathrm{DW}}}{h_0^{\mathrm{Q}}} = 1 - e^{-4\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2t}). \tag{5.11}$$

Then the fact that the Hankel determinant τ_n^{DW} satisfies the Toda equation (1.30) is used to show that the constant is in fact simply $1 - e^{-4\gamma}$.

For the product $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}}$ we can follow the same procedure. The only difference is that the first factor in the product is

$$\frac{h_0^{\mathrm{HT}}}{h_0^{\mathrm{Q}}} = 1 + e^{-4\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2t}). \tag{5.12}$$

All other calculations are identical to those in [BL14, section 8.5], and the result is that

$$\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_k^{\mathrm{HT}}}{h_k^{\mathrm{Q}}} = 1 + e^{-4\gamma}. \tag{5.13}$$

Combining (5.9), (5.10), and (5.13) proves the formula (1.29) for C. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5.

References

[BlBo12] P.M. Bleher and T. Bothner, Exact solution of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions: critical line between disordered and antiferroelectric phases. Disordered phase. *Random Matrices Theory Appl.* **1**(4) (2012), 1250012, 43.

[BlBo14] P.M. Bleher and T. Bothner, Calculation of the constant factor in the six-vertex model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D* **1**(4) (2014), 363–427.

[BF06] P.M. Bleher and V.V. Fokin, Exact solution of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions. Disordered phase. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **268** (2006), 223–284.

[BL09-1] P.M. Bleher and K. Liechty, Exact solution of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions. Ferroelectric phase, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **286** (2009), 777–801.

[BL09-2] P.M. Bleher and K. Liechty, Exact solution of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions. Critical line between ferroelectric and disordered phases. *J. Stat. Phys.* **134**(3) (2009), 463–485.

[BL10] P.M. Bleher and K. Liechty, Exact solution of the six-vertex model with domain wall boundary conditions. antiferroelectric phase. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **63** (2010), 779–829.

[BL14] Pavel Bleher and Karl Liechty, Random Matrices and the Six-Vertex Model (CRM Monograph), American Mathematical Society (2014), 224 pages, ISBN-13: 978-1470409616

[BL15] P.M. Bleher and K. Liechty, Six-vertex model with partial domain wall boundary conditions: Ferroelectric phase. *J. Math. Phys.* **56** (2015), 023302.

[Ize87] A. G. Izergin, Partition function of the six-vertex model in a finite volume. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **297** (1987), no. 2, 331–333; translation in *Soviet Phys. Dokl.* **32** (1987), 878–880.

[KLS] R. Koekoek, P.A. Lesky, and R.F. Swarttouw, *Hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials and their q -analogues.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. xx+578 pp. ISBN: 978-3-642-05013-8.

[Kor82] V. E. Korepin, Calculation of norms of Bethe wave functions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **86** (1982), 391-418.

[Kup96] G. Kuperberg, Another proof of the alternating sign matrix conjecture. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (1996), 139–150.

[Kup02] G. Kuperberg, Symmetry classes of alternating-sign matrices under one roof. *Ann. Math.*, **156** (2002), 835–866.

[MRR82] W.H. Mills, D. Robbins, and H. Rumsey, Proof of the Macdonald conjecture. *Invent. Math.*, **66**(1) (1983), 73–87.

[RK15] G. A. P. Ribeiro. and V. E. Korepin, Thermodynamic limit of the six-vertex model with reflecting end. *J. Phys. A* **48**(4) (2015), 045205, 12.

[Tsu98] O. Tsuchiya, Determinant formula for the six-vertex model with reflecting end. *J. Math. Phys.*, **39**(11) (1998), 5946–5951.

[Zei96] D. Zeilberger, Proof of the alternating sign matrix conjecture. *Electron. J. Combin.* **3**(2) (1996), Research Paper 13, approx. 84 pp.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, 402 N. Blackford St., Indianapolis, IN 46202, U.S.A.

E-mail address: bleher@math.iupui.edu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, DePaul University, Chicago, IL 60614, U.S.A.

E-mail address: kliechty@depaul.edu